

ASHBY & GEDDES

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW

500 DELAWARE AVENUE

P. O. BOX 1150

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19899

TELEPHONE
302-654-1888

FACSIMILE
302-654-2067

July 9, 2010

The Honorable Leonard P. Stark
United States District Court
844 N. King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Re: *Power Integrations v. Fairchild Semiconductor International, Inc., et al.*,
C.A. No. 08-309-JJF-LPS

Dear Judge Stark,

Pursuant to the Court's June 29, 2010 Order [D.I. 332], I write on behalf of Defendants Fairchild Semiconductor Corp., Fairchild Semiconductor International, Inc., and System General Corp. (collectively, "Fairchild") concerning Fairchild's view on how this case should proceed in light of Judge Farnan's impending retirement.

Fairchild and Power Integrations have unanimously consented to Your Honor deciding the pending case-dispositive and *Daubert* motions. There is not, however, unanimous consent for Your Honor to handle the entire remainder of the case.

Fairchild believes that resolution of the pending motions may greatly simplify – and potentially eliminate – many of the issues to be tried. Thus, Fairchild respectfully suggests that once Your Honor has decided the pending motions and a trial judge has been assigned, the Court set a scheduling conference. The parties can meet and confer in advance of such a conference to consider the impact of Your Honor's decisions with respect to the pending motions on the issues to be tried, and submit a proposed schedule. The Court could then set a trial date that is convenient for the Court, the parties, and the witnesses. Indeed, depending on the outcome of the pending motions and the status of the reexaminations, trial may be significantly shortened or even unnecessary.

Fairchild understands that Power Integrations intends to propose that the Court proceed with pretrial matters such as motions in limine, objections to exhibits, and the like prior to resolving the pending motions. Fairchild believes this proposal would be highly inefficient for everyone involved as it would require briefing by the parties and decisions by the Court on issues that ultimately may not need to be decided.

The Honorable Leonard P. Stark
July 9, 2010
Page 2

Respectfully,

/s/ John G. Day

John G. Day

JGD/nml

cc: Counsel of Record (via electronic mail)

422128